

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

GAYLAND BRION COLES,

Plaintiff,

No. 13-cv-14450

vs.

Hon. Gerald E. Rosen

DEARBORN MID-WEST CO., et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION AND DISMISSING
PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT, IN ITS ENTIRETY, WITH PREJUDICE

At a session of said Court, held in
the U.S. Courthouse, Detroit, Michigan
on March 31, 2015

PRESENT: Honorable Gerald E. Rosen
United States District Chief Judge

Plaintiff Gayland Brion Coles, acting *pro se*, filed this lawsuit against his former employer, Dearborn Mid-West Company, and various supervisors and co-workers, alleging claims of race discrimination, hostile work environment and retaliation in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1981, and age discrimination and retaliation in violation of the Age Discrimination and Employment Act (ADEA), 29 U.S.C. § 621 *et seq.*¹ This matter

¹ Although Mr. Coles is acting *pro se*, he is no novice litigator. The Court notes that Plaintiff has filed no fewer than six previous lawsuits alleging claims of employment discrimination and retaliation similar to those he alleges in this action. See, e.g., *Coles v. Dearborn Mid-West Co.*, Eastern District of Michigan No. 14-13343; *Coles v. Flex-N-*

is presently before the Court on the March 9, 2015 Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Michael J. Hluchaniuk recommending that the Court grant Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, deny Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment, and deny Defendants' Motion for Sanctions. Plaintiff timely filed Objections to the Magistrate Judge's R&R. The Court has had the opportunity to review the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, Plaintiff's Objections, and the entire record of this matter and concurs in the determination and recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. Therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation of March 9, 2015 [**Dkt. # 100**] is ADOPTED by the Court.

Accordingly, for the reasons stated by the Magistrate Judge,

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment [**Dkt. # 29**] is GRANTED and Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment [**Dkt. # 40**] is DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants' Motion for Sanctions [**Dkt. # 50**] is DENIED.

Therefore, Plaintiff's Complaint, is DISMISSED, in its entirety, with prejudice.

Gate Forming Technologies, No. 11-11406; *Coles v. Central Metal Products*, 07-10661; *Coles v. Production Stamping, Inc.*, No. 99-73342; *Coles v. Austin et al.*, No. 97-75820; *Coles v. Urban Teacher, et al.*, 92-cv-74519; see also *Coles v. Sommers, Schwartz*, No. 08-12270 (suit against lawyer who represented Coles in an earlier lawsuit, *Coles v. Flex-N-Gate Forming Technologies*, No. 04-73671).

Let Judgment be entered accordingly,

s/Gerald E. Rosen

Chief Judge, United States District Court

Dated: March 31, 2015

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on March 31, 2015, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/Julie Owens

Case Manager, (313) 234-5135